



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The beginner, that is to say, can get on very well with a grammar in which the terms denote simple, fundamental, clearly distinguished concepts, even though they are not strictly in accord with the latest results of philological research.

However, since I do not mean to decry the claims of scholarship even in the most elementary grammar, I would propose as a third requirement that the nomenclature, wherever possible without violating the two previous requirements, should conform to the results of the widest comparative study. If it is possible to frame a simple and clearly defined system of English grammar which, while it traces for the pupil the distinctive pattern of English, is at the same time in harmony with the grammar of Sanskrit, old Persian, Greek, Latin, and the Romance and Germanic languages, by all means let us have it. That is the ideal grammar of the vernacular.

But I do not look for such a grammar to appear very soon. For my part, after such study as I have given to the grammars of a variety of languages, ancient and modern, savage and civilized, I come back in a chastened mood to the sage words of Tylor in his *Primitive Culture*:

It is hard to say which is the more striking, the want of scientific system in the expression of thought by words, or the infinite cleverness of detail by which this imperfection is got over, so that he who has an idea does somehow make shift to get it clearly in words before his own and other minds. The language by which a nation with highly developed art and knowledge and sentiment must express its thoughts is no apt machine devised for such special work, but an old, barbaric engine added to and altered, patched and tinkered into some sort of capability.

FUNCTIONAL CHANGE OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN GERMAN

T. J. C. DIEKHOFF
The University of Michigan

Co-operation between the representatives of the various branches of linguistic study is a most urgent need of our time, and any movement in that direction ought to be heartily welcomed. For this reason, if for no other, I am glad to add a word to the discussion of Professor Hale's paper, of which he very kindly sent me a copy beforehand.

But I can conceive how co-operation, if it be carried too far, if it involve compromises in essentials, might work serious injury to scientific method and do violence to scientific truth. I am very glad to express my sincere admiration for Professor Hale's paper, and I shall show my appreciation for his work, not in the usual manner, by eulogizing and saying "yea and amen" to all he proposes, but rather by pointing out some difficulties which his scheme leaves in the way. As a true

scientist, he is after the truth, and will convert new difficulties into so many beacon lights on the way toward the truth.

Latin and the Romance languages, on the one side, and the Germanic languages, on the other, are related, not as mother and daughters, but rather as sisters and cousins, which, together with the Greek and other sisters, find their common origin in an ancestor removed from them by many centuries. Moreover, these descendants had practically no contact one with the other, and every one could develop quite in accordance with its own genius. It must therefore be expected, and I am inclined to think all too true what Mr. Hale at the outset states to be perfectly possible, that the subjunctive and in general the phenomena of one language will often be quite different from apparently the same phenomena of other languages both as to origin and as to function. What is true of the moods is equally true of the cases. But I shall confine myself to the subjunctive, following Mr. Hale's leadership.

All the European members of the Indo-Germanic family, except the Greek, have abandoned either the optative or the subjunctive; some, possibly even more significantly, have merged forms of the two into one paradigm. There can be but one inference: very early in their history the distinction between the two moods must have become so faint that the lines of demarcation between the two were obliterated. That in Latin the subjunctive should have adequately expressed all the relations for which earlier two moods were needed, and sufficiently used to be kept intact, seems to me improbable, because no linguistic form becomes obsolete except by disuse, no form dies so long as there is any need for it. And does not the fact that the Germanic languages maintained the optative rather than the subjunctive suggest at least that the coalescence of the two moods in the Romance languages on the one hand, in the Germanic on the other, came about over different routes?

I confess, the leading meanings of the old Indo-Germanic subjunctive (volition and anticipation) are too nearly related to the meanings of the optative (wish, obligation or propriety, natural likelihood, possibility, ideal certainty) for either to have kept its territory inviolate for any length of time. It seems quite plausible to me that in the mother tongue the meaning of the two moods should have been more strongly marked than we can judge from their descendants in the various languages, though I do not presume even to guess what these meanings may have been. But, at all events, it seems quite impossible to determine just what functions of the Romance subjunctive, and of the Germanic optative, go back to the one, what ones to the other, of the original two moods. In the effort, therefore, "to make a good grouping of the mass of constructions under a relatively small number of leading forces, and an arrangement of such a kind as to exhibit the relation of dependent uses to the inde-

pendent uses out of which they have sprung," I have for a number of years, in my lectures on German grammar, and, notice, for German grammar only, made bold to wipe out altogether the faint line between the ancestral optative and subjunctive, and have combined all the uses of the two moods, as outlined by Mr. Hale, and essentially agreed to also by Brugmann, under two large heads. I have been led to do this because it appeared to me that the volitive subjunctive on the one hand, and the optatives of wish, of obligation, propriety, or reasonableness on the other, contained an element of volition; while the anticipatory, or near-future, subjunctive, and the optatives of natural likelihood, of possibility, of certainty in purely imagined cases, all seem to hint at a more purely intellectual element, at knowledge, or the lack of it. I have called the one the optative subjunctive, and the other the potential subjunctive.

Purely from its uses in German, with the grammar of which I am concerned, I had arrived at these two inclusive functions. I doubt whether it is more than coincidence that the functions shown by Mr. Hale to have originally existed in the Indo-Germanic optative and subjunctive should seem capable of being classified under these two. For in the progress of the language, it seems, sometimes the feeling for the significance of some given form or construction changes.

To explain, for example, the subjunctive in Modern German after *bis* or *bevor* as an anticipatory subjunctive, in Mr. Hale's sense, would, in my judgment, do violence to the construction, in spite of the circumstance that also in Germanic the subjunctive must have been verging closely to the future indicative, as appears from the fact that Wulfila renders a number of Greek future indicatives by present subjunctives, rather than by a periphrastic future, though this also was in existence in his day.

Also, in both Old High German and Middle High German the particle *unze* with the subjunctive (corresponding to our *bis*) is in a large majority of cases found in clauses depending on a main clause with an imperative or an optative. In very many of them, to be sure, it is quite natural to interpret the subjunctive as anticipatory (in Mr. Hale's sense). In others clearly an optative element finds expression. But that it is the influence of the main verb, either in form or meaning, which calls for the subjunctive after *unze*, becomes clear, or at least very probable, when we observe that after an indicative in the main clause, either present or preterite, *unze* is regularly followed by the indicative.

On the other hand, the particle which in Old High German and Middle High German corresponds most nearly to the Gothic *faurthizei*, *ér* and *é*, all of them meaning "before" (English "ere long"), is also after the indicative in main clauses commonly followed by the subjunctive. Notice in this connection that *é* and *ér* are comparative adverbs as to form, and collateral forms are *ér denne*, *ér daz*.

In the light of this fact it cannot be without significance that in Gothic *faurthizei*, also a comparative form (*faurthis* + *ei*, the relative particle regularly attached to demonstratives) is the only one of all the temporal conjunctions followed by the subjunctive. *Und thatei*, "until," "as long as," is usually, and *unte*, with the same meaning, corresponding etymologically to the Old High German *unze*, is almost in every case followed by the indicative.

The reason for this odd discrimination, it seems to me, must be sought in an entirely different field. The particle *denne*, in Old High German, Middle High German, and Old Saxon often used in connection with the conjunction *ér*, *é* (which are old comparative forms, as stated), is the regular particle used after the comparative. It corresponds to our *denn*, still sometimes used after comparatives, English "than." On the other hand, in Old High German and Middle High German the subjunctive is regularly found in subordinate clauses after a comparative in a main clause. A familiar example we have in Walter's: *Diu krone ist elter danne der künec Philippes si*. In Old Saxon we find after *than* the indicative, if the main clause contains a negative, the subjunctive if it does not. But in Old Saxon *than* alone has developed also into a temporal conjunction with the meaning "until," and as such it takes the subjunctive also after a negative in the main clause: *thia man hangon ni lietun lengeran hwila, than im that lif skridi*.

What the origin of the subjunctive after the comparative may be need not be discussed here. Behaghel thinks it is potential, in *Anerkennung der Tatsache, dass jeder Vergleich hinkt*. *So die bluomen uz dem grase dringent, same si lachen gegen der spilden sunnen*, is to mean when put back into its paratactic prototype, *Die Blumen dringen aus dem Grase: so lachen sie wohl der Sonne entgegen*. However that may be, the point I wish to make is this: the subjunctive after the Gothic *faurthizei*, and after the Old High German and Middle High German and Old Saxon *ér* or *ér thenne*, is the same subjunctive as that regularly found after other comparatives, not that of anticipation. Possibly the particle *thenne* alone may have been strong enough to attract the subjunctive, as might be the case, when, in Old Saxon, it is used in a temporal sense. That a single word is capable of exerting so great an influence is clear from the fact that in Middle High German the negative particle *niht* is often followed by a genitive in the sentence, which cannot be accounted for in any other way than by analogy with the indefinite pronoun *niht*, regularly followed by the partitive genitive.

And yet I should explain the subjunctive after *bis*, *bevor*, *ehe*, in Modern German as having usually an optative force. It is rarely found. Judge this sentence: *Ich will dich nicht wiedersehen, bis da* (or *bis nicht*) *komme der Tag, an dem ich ohne zu erröten vor dich hintreten darf*.

That I am not alone in this feeling, I am assured by this odd, so-called unexplainable, wholly illogical negative particle, which is quite often found (though not the rule) in dependent clauses with *ehe*, *bevor*, *bis*, after negative main clauses. To be sure, the negative particle comes in by contamination with a regular conditional clause: *wenn ich nicht einst ohne zu erröten vor dich hintreten kann*. But just because in a conditional clause such as this the wish that the condition might be fulfilled is so often implied, the contamination took place. I am glad to find Matthias concurring with me in the interpretation of sentences of this type. He grants that the sentence without *nicht* is the more logical, but adds: *Dafür wird es ihm [i.e., the man who refuses to use the illogical nicht] auch versagt bleiben, in diesen Zeitsätzen zugleich den Wunsch nach der Erfüllung einer gesetzten Bedingung nachzittern zu lassen*. This seems to be then a pretty clear case in which the meaning of the subjunctive has changed in the same language in the course of its development.

A much clearer instance of the same process we have in our German subjunctive of indirect discourse. Let me say parenthetically at this point that, as in so many other instances, so also in the treatment of this subjunctive, our common grammars are very inadequate; and then proceed to our German indirect-discourse subjunctive and its metamorphosis in the course of its history.

It is quite generally accepted with Behaghel that the indirect-discourse subjunctive is of potential origin; I mean potential in the sense in which I proposed to use the term, involving, that is to say, some element of uncertainty. But I am inclined to think that, as to its original meaning in the Germanic languages, Tenney Frank is correct, who contends that it is optative rather than potential.¹ He establishes, beyond the point of any great doubt, that the majority of the group of words regularly construed in the older periods of the Germanic languages with the subjunctive contained a collateral meaning of wishing or hoping, and would call for an optative subjunctive in the dependent clause, if we assume, as is ordinarily done, and as also Mr. Hale suggests, that the mood of the dependent clause was originally the same as that called for by the corresponding independent prototype. This does not preclude, of course, that other functions should have been developed within the dependent clause. The group of words denoting actual speech, such as Gothic *qithan*, etc., stand second in order in governing dependent clauses that contain a subjunctive, while verbs of exact knowledge, like Gothic *witan*, seldom employ the subjunctive.

But owing to the fact that not only words of wishing but also words of saying called for a subjunctive, the feeling for the inherent meaning of these subjunctives in indirect discourse must early have grown more

¹ *Journal of English and German Philology*, VII.

or less indistinct. This must be inferred from the observation that the subjunctive in indirect discourse became more and more common, as time passed, also in sentences in which neither an optative nor a potential was in any wise called for. The subjunctive paled into a mere sign of indirect discourse without any meaning of its own.

In form two classes of indirect discourse were now distinguished. Clauses depending on words of speaking or thinking, etc., took the subjunctive, while those depending on words expressing knowledge or certainty kept the indicative. In contrast with this indicative, perhaps, the subjunctive in indirect discourse acquired potential meaning, at least in the comparatively few cases in which it has any inherent meaning at all today. I refer to clauses in which, at the discretion of the speaker, the subjunctive may vary with the indicative. *Schiller sagt, das Leben sei der Güter höchstes nicht; der Uebel grösstes aber sei die Schuld.* On the other hand: *Ich kann die Gewissensqual nicht mehr ertragen, und mache entschlossen ein Ende. Schon Schiller lehrt uns ja, dass das Leben der Güter höchstes nicht, der Uebel grösstes aber die Schuld ist.* In such cases the indicative indicates that the speaker wishes expressly to record his agreement with the content of the words quoted, though the subjunctive in the corresponding sentence by no means implies that the speaker entertains any doubt as to the veracity of the source of his information, as is commonly suggested by the statements in our German grammars. We use less equivocal means for this purpose than the subjunctive.

And so in many uses of the subjunctive in German changes have come about in the course of their history. But if I want to deal with Modern German, must I not name my subjunctive in accordance with its meaning in Modern German? To treat it historically is a different matter. No one would seriously attempt that in a high school. I wonder if I have been able, in this short commentary upon Mr. Hale's paper, to make myself sufficiently clear to this audience, mature, and probably for the most part trained in linguistics.

And it appears to me that I am but pursuing the same thread if I venture to ask on what ground we should in English or German grammar study auxiliaries under the heading of moods. Should we not on the same ground have to study also English prepositions under the heading of cases, and many adverbs under the heading of both tenses and moods?

Does not Mr. Hale unconsciously, in spite of his refutation of the same suggestion from another source, and with the best possible intention, propose to modern-language teachers the same grammatical norms, derived largely from the facts presented in Latin and Greek, from the application of which, particularly in the field of the Germanic languages, as being less closely akin, we have suffered so long? Would not the preposterous assertion for which a prominent speaker at the Classical Conference went

on record a few years ago—that any one knowing well his Latin grammar hardly need study English grammar at all—be in a way justified if we granted the assumption that the laws recording the usage of one language are applicable also to other tongues?

In conclusion: The treatment of the Germanic tenses in the same manner is open to even more serious objections, because all the tenses except the present and the preterite, though probably stimulated by the completer tense-system of the Latin, were developed in Germanic times, and passed through a number of changes, both in form and in function, which can be plainly traced in the literary monuments of the various Germanic dialects.

THE CLOSING OF THE SYMPOSIUM

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE
The University of Chicago

I have been asked to close the discussion, basing my remarks upon the printed abstracts of the papers which followed mine. This I gladly do.

My prevailing feeling is one of satisfaction. Five years ago I spoke upon the same subject before a body of high-school teachers of English French, German, Greek, and Latin. At the end of my talk, not a voice was raised in support of my position, and many were raised against it. My experience in frequent conversations with individuals upon the same matter has been in general the same. After I had read a paper on the subject before the American Philological Association in 1909, the opposition in the discussion which followed was more vigorous than the support. I was prepared for the same results when I addressed the Modern Language Association of America in 1910, and again when I read before the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club the paper with which the present symposium opened. I have indicated in that paper the entirely different spirit in which the Modern Language Association appeared, in its subsequent action, to view the contentions put before it, and I find again an entirely different spirit in the discussion at Ann Arbor. There are differences of opinion in detail; but in most of the abstracts the feeling seems clear that there *is* a large amount of identity in the syntax of the languages most commonly studied, and that, to the extent to which this exists, we ought, in the interests of teaching no less than of science, to employ a uniform grammatical terminology.

The same feeling is likewise shown in a most important way, by the realization of the hope expressed in my paper, that a joint committee on the subject might be established by the leading bodies of this country concerned in the teaching of language; namely, the National Education Asso-